

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
BUILDINGS AND ROADS BRANCH
JIND CIRCLE

The 28th October, 1982

No. 373.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land is likely to be required to be taken by the Government at public expense for a public purpose namely, for construction of Village Murthal to Village Hassanpur in District Sonapat, it is hereby notified that the land in the locality described below is likely to be acquired for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provision of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern.

In exercise of, the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to authorise the officers, for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested who has any objection to the acquisition of any land in the locality may within 30 days of the publication of this notification file an objection in writing before the Land Acquisition Collector, Haryana, P. W. D., B. & R. Branch, Ambala, Cantt. under the said Act.

SPECIFICATIONS

District	Tehsil	Locality/ Village	Hadbast No.	Area in acres	Khasra Nos.
Sonapat	Sonapat	Murthal	91	3.20	A strip of road from village Murthal to Village Hassanpur 40 in width passing the Killa No. on consolidation path.
					69
					84
					21 1/1, 1/2, 2/1, 2/2, 8/1, 8/2, 9/1,
					84
					9/2, 10, 13/1, 13/2, 14/1, 14/2, 15, 16/1,
					84
					16/2, 17/1, 17/2, 25, 26, 27, 28
					83
					20/4, 21/1, 21/2, 22
					98
					21/1, 21/2
					99
					1, 2/1, 2/2, 2/3, 3, 8/1, 8/2, 9/1, 9/2,
					99
					13/1, 13/2, 14/1, 14/2, 16, 17/1, 17/2,
					99
					24/1, 24/2, 25/1, 25/2, 25/3, 26

District	Tehsil	Locality/ Village	Hadbast No.	Area in acres	Khasra Nos.
Sonepat	Sonepat	Murthal— concl'd	91— concl'd	3.20— concl'd	<div>111</div> <div>1, 2</div> <div>112</div> <div>367, 368, 300, 487 to 491</div>
Sonepat	Sonepat	Hassanpur	99	4.04	<div>5</div> <div>41</div> <div>44</div> <div>16, 17</div> <div>7</div> <div>45</div> <div>1/1, 1/2, 2, 5, 6/1, 6/2, 14, 15</div> <div>46</div> <div>10, 11/1, 11/2, 12/1, 12/2, 17, 18/1,</div> <div>46</div> <div>18/2, 19, 20, 23, 24/1, 24/2, 25/1, 25/2, 26</div> <div>52</div> <div>1, 2, 9/1, 9/2, 10/1, 10/2, 12, 13/1, 13/2,</div> <div>52</div> <div>14, 16/3, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 24, 25/1, 25/2</div> <div>53</div> <div>5/1, 5/2, 4</div> <div>51</div> <div>57</div> <div>21</div> <div>5</div> <div>65, 109, 133 to 139, 109 to 149</div>
Total			7.24		

(Sd.)

Superintending Engineer,
Jind Circle, P.W.D., B. & R. Branch,
Jind.

IRRIGATION AND POWER DEPARTMENT

ORDER

The 10th November, 1982

No. 20125/2-L.—Whereas the land described in the Haryana Government notification No. 15498/2/L, dated 27th August, 1982, issued under section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 has been declared to be needed at the expense of the Haryana Government for a public purpose, namely, for the construction of Banarsi Kameda Feeder Channel reach K.M. 0—11.450 of taking at RD. 58070/left of Banarsi distributary in villages Mahlaka, Kharla Kalan, Gujar Negla, Sheikhpur Bai-Khera, Mau, Chitora, Sakras, Kherala Khurd, Nahrika, Dugri, Raniali, Ahamad Bas, Ferozepur and Padla Shahpur in tehsil Ferozepur Jhirka, district Gurgaon.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, the Governor of Haryana hereby directs the Land Acquisition Officer, Irrigation Department, Haryana Karnal to take action for acquisition of the land described in the specifications appended to the declaration published with the aforesaid notification.

By order of Governor of Haryana.

O. P. SEHGAL,

Superintending Engineer,
Ujina Diversion Drain Circle No. II,
Gurgaon.

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 6th October, 1982

No. 9(1)82-PV-6Lab./9249.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Orient Steel Industries Limited 20/3, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 366/1981

between

SHRI PARMOD KUMAR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ORIENT STEEL
INDUSTRIES LIMITED, 20/1, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present.—

Shri K. P. Agrawal, for the management.
Nemo, for the workman.

AWARD

The State Government of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Parmod Kumar and the management of M/s Orient Steel Industries Limited 20/1, Mathura Road, Faridabad by order No. ID/FD/94/81/52158, dated 21st October, 1981, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Parmod Kumar was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Notices of the reference were sent to the parties who appeared and filed their pleadings. The following issues were framed by my order, dated 1st January, 1982:—

- (1) Whether the workman remained absent from 19th March, 1981 ? If so, to what effect ?
- (2) Whether the termination of service of Shri Parmod Kumar was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management examined Shri Kuldip Bhumby, Personal Officer as MW-1 and Shri Om Parkash Time Office Incharge as MW-2. The workman examined himself as MW-1, and the case was fixed for the arguments. On the date fixed, the management was present but none was present on behalf of the workman. At this stage, Shri K. P. Agrawal, representative of the management made a statement that the workman had settled his dispute with the management and had received Rs 5,500 in settlement of his dispute. He filed photo copy of settlement under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act Ex. M-1 and copy of receipt Ex. M-2. The workman had signed Ex. M-1 and M-2 in his presence.

In view of the above, I pass my award that the dispute had been mutually settled by the parties and there nothing remained for adjudication.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated the 27th August, 1982.

Endst. No. 942, dated the 30th August, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 12th/15th October, 1982

No. 9(1) 82-P V-6Lab/9998.— In pursuance of the provision of section-17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Paul Rubber Works, Plot No. 9, N. I. T. Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 79/1982

between

SHRI RAM KISHAN, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S PAUL
RUBBER WORKS, PLOT NO. 9, N. I. T. FARIDABAD.

Present.—

Shri Ram Kishan, workman himself.

Nemo for the management.

AWARD

The Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Ram Kishan and the management of M/s. Paul Rubber Works Plot No. 9, N. I. T. Faridabad, by order No. ID/FD/21/82/9868 dated 9th March, 1982, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Kishan, was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Notice of the reference were issued to the parties. The workman appeared but the management refused to receive the notice of the case. Therefore, a U. P. C. notice under rule 1^o of the Industrial Disputes Punjab Rules, 1958 was also sent but the management failed to appear despite it. The management was proceeded *ex parte* and the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. In evidence, the workman examined himself and deposed that he worked in the respondent factory for the last 12 years. His work was satisfactory. Their G. P. F. and E. S. I. were not deducted. They had made a complaint about it. He was removed from service on 7th November, 1981.

Believing the *ex parte* statement of the workman, I find that the order of termination of service was wrongful. Therefore, I give my award that the workman is entitled to his re-instatement with full back wages.

Dated the 14th September, 1982.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endorst. No. 1010, dated 22nd September, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.